

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 6, 10, 13 to 16 and 18 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms et al. (U.S. 5,676,754) in view of Keiser et al. (U.S. 2003/0091791). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms et al. in view of Keiser et al. and further in view of McCartney (U.S. 5,386,771). Claims 7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms et al. in view of Keiser et al. as applied to claims 1 to 6, 10, 13 to 16 and 18 to 22, and further in view of Fujiki (U.S. 5,554,333).

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 1 to 6, 10, 13 to 16 and 18 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms et al. in view of Keiser et al. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms et al. in view of Keiser et al. and further in view of McCartney. Claims 7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms et al. in view of Keiser et al. as applied to claims 1 to 6, 10, 13 to 16 and 18 to 22, and further in view of Fujiki.

Claim 1, 18 and 21 recite “a porous layer disposed at a circumference of the drum and configured to provide a pathway for air from a first location between the chill roll and a web passing over the chill roll and a second location having a lower air pressure.”

As admitted by the Office Action Helms does not show this feature. Moreover, Keiser does not show any pathway for air at all as claimed. The chill roll in Keiser has a porous surface “including peaks of the chromium material surrounded by pockets or cavities” to impart to a polyolefin resin on paper “a plurality of peaks projecting outwardly from the polyolefin coating surface corresponding in height to depth of the pockets of the chill roll.” See [0037] and [0038] of Keiser.

It is absolutely clear that air does not pass from one end of the roll to the opposite side of the chill roll as stated in the Office Action, as the paper with its polyolefin coating in Keiser is pressed between to form a matte finish, and no air passes in a pathway between the web and the chill roll.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 18 and 21 and their dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, **claim 5** recites the “chill roll as recited in claim 1 wherein the pathway is configured to enable the air to move in a radial direction.”

The cite in the Office Action to Helms Fig. 11 is claim 5 is not understood. Helms does not teach any air pathway at all, and Fig. 11 is a flowchart. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 5 for this reason as well is respectfully requested.

With further respect to **claim 6**, Helms does not teach any pathway for air as argued by the Office Action.

In addition, with respect to the arguments for **claims 14 and 15** the reference to Fig. 11 is not understood.

With respect to the arguments for **claim 16**, Helms does not teach a pathway for air 3, and this reference numeral is not understood.

With respect to **claim 18**, no porous layer 11 is shown in Helms as asserted by the Office Action and the reference to Fig. 11 is not understood.


Withdrawal of the rejections to these claims for these reasons as well is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940